

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
KAMAL KARNA ROY, *pro se*,

Plaintiff,

-against-

USA GOVT WASHINGTON

Defendant.

-----X
DORA L. IRIZARRY, U.S. District Judge:

SUMMARY ORDER
08-MC-554 (DLI)

On October 9, 2008, the court received another one of *pro se* plaintiff Kamal Karna Roy's lengthy and illegible submissions that have caused him to be barred from filing any new *in forma pauperis* actions in this court without first obtaining leave of the court. Mr. Roy's initial submission did not contain any request for leave, but a subsequent filing included an "Affidavit for leave to find petition as poor – a civil rights complaints" [*sic*]. Liberally construing this document as a request for leave to file the action, the court denies his request that the action be filed.

The court previously summarized Mr. Roy's extensive litigation history in this and other courts in *Roy v. We the People*, No. 07-CV-2930 (DLI), 2007 WL 4299177 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 5, 2007). In *Roy v. Democratic Republic of USA*, No. 08-CV-1257 (DLI), 2008 WL 3413898 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 8, 2008), the court enjoined Mr. Roy from filing any new *in forma pauperis* actions in this court without first obtaining leave of the court and directed the Clerk of Court to return to Mr. Roy, without filing, any action that is received without an application seeking leave to file. Although the November 10, 2008 "Affidavit" may be construed as such a request, it contains no facts or legal arguments in support of such a motion. Accordingly, Mr. Roy is denied leave to file the instant action. Similar to his previous submissions, the instant complaint is improper and frivolous, in that it lacks any basis in law or fact. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

The court's Order barring Mr. Roy from filing future *in forma pauperis* complaints remains in effect. The Clerk of Court is directed to return, without filing, any future *in forma pauperis* complaints submitted by Mr. Roy without a clear request for leave to file. Mr. Roy is warned that any future request must be clear, concise, and contain arguments in support of his request. The court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
March 6, 2008

_____/s/
DORA L. IRIZARRY
United States District Judge